

tice, having the power, they must take the responsibility of its exercise. And if the principles of justice and equity are ever again re-established in this land, I trust that responsibility will be met by the people; and that, notwithstanding constitutional restrictions, notwithstanding the attempt to hamper the Legislature by a provision in this Constitution, they will make restitution for the wrong you may do. I think it is "the unkindest cut of all" not even to leave that question to the future, not even to the contingencies of those very works of internal improvement, which the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Billingsley) so kindly reminded the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Cushing) were built by the smaller counties coming to the aid of the city of Baltimore. My own county and myself stood by the side of those named by the gentleman from St. Mary's in sustaining the city of Baltimore; and without our votes, not one of the measures necessary to build those works could have been carried. And in making the canvass afterwards, I had to meet the objection that I had voted for works of internal improvement to bring down coal and wood and other articles to Baltimore to come in competition with the trade of our own citizens at home.

And yet, you now refuse to trust even to the contingency that the enormous profits of these works may bring such revenues into the coffers of the State as to give her the ability, should she at any time have the feeling of justice, to make some compensation for that which you propose to take away so unjustly. You propose to tie up the hands of future legislatures so that they shall not have even that discretion.

Mr. President, it is a fact in the history of this State, that not a very great while after the introduction of slaves, the Legislature provided as a reward for faithful services, and also in accordance with the feelings of many of that day who had some conscientious scruples upon the subject, a mode in which such feelings could be gratified by bestowing freedom upon those slaves that might be supposed to merit it. Provisions were made to allow of their manumission—the mode of manumission being prescribed by the Legislature. And the free negroes in the State are nearly every one of them the slaves manumitted under those laws or the descendants of those manumitted slaves. Why then was it, that about the year 1831, this system that had been in operation for perhaps a hundred years—I do not know how far back this system of emancipation had been inaugurated—why was it, that after discussion throughout the State, in the public press, in the halls of legislation, the General Assembly suddenly put a stop to it, and declared that in future emancipation should not take place in Maryland, only on

condition of removal from the State, having special reference to the colony of Liberia? And why was it that just about the same time, the Legislature declared that no free negro from any other State should come to reside into the State of Maryland? It was upon the most pressing and urgent public necessity; upon the experience of the evils growing out of that system of emancipation; because the fact was forced upon the public mind, upon the conscience of every private individual, that we had this institution among us and that it was inevitable for the benefit of both to continue the relation of master and slave, until in the providence of God a way should be opened to transfer the manumitted slave to the home of his ancestors upon the shores of Africa. And that was the system inaugurated, that was the policy adopted and which prevailed in Maryland unquestioned, down to the commencement of these unfortunate troubles.

And why was it? Had not manumission been tried elsewhere? Had it not been tried all over the New England States? Had they not gradually dispossessed themselves of this property upon the ground that it was no longer profitable, that it interfered with the rights of the poor? If you look into the Dred Scott decision, so much abused, you will find some historical facts stated by Chief Justice Taney, showing the ground for emancipation in Pennsylvania, New York and other States. Nowhere was it upon the ground that it was a sin against God and nature; but it was upon the ground of public expediency that the property had ceased to be profitable there, and it was deemed necessary to get clear of it, all those who should be born after a certain date were to be free, and hence, no one was going to the expense of rearing the children for freedom. You do not find the New England States doing anything of that sort, for they kept but few of their slaves.

Now, what was the operation of that system upon the moral condition of the negroes thus set free, and what was its operation upon society there? Let me show you what was the operation; I shall not have time for more than a glance. I have a pamphlet here full of facts not only in regard to the operation of emancipation in New England, but in Jamaica, Hayti, and everywhere, that this unfortunate class have been left to themselves without the control of an owner to look after them, care for them, and exercise over them a proper discipline to keep them within the range of his protection. Let me read enough to show what these facts justify:

"Gigantic efforts are now being made to convince the people of the North that the overthrow of the present relations of the black and white races in the South or what is mistakenly called 'the abolition of slavery,' would be a great benefit to all concern-